

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

CHELSEA SINGLETON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 2:17-CV-105-WKW
)	[WO]
NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting)	
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

On December 19, 2017, the court construed Plaintiff Chelsea Singleton's objection to the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as a motion for an extension of time. (Doc. # 17, at 4.) The court granted that motion, giving Ms. Singleton until February 1, 2018, to file her brief in support of her complaint. That deadline has now come and gone.

Ms. Singleton's Amended Complaint was filed nearly a year ago, on February 28, 2017. (Doc. # 4.) Her response brief was then due forty days after Defendant filed her Answer—so by July 10, 2017. (Doc. # 5, at 2.) That deadline came and went. Then the Magistrate Judge entered an order on October 24, 2017, giving Ms. Singleton until November 13, 2017, to file a response showing why her complaint should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. (Doc. # 12.) Ms.

Singleton responded by asking for more time. (Doc. # 13, at 1.) That was also her response when the Magistrate Judge recommended dismissing her case for failure to prosecute, and it was that request this court granted in December.

Suffice it to say, the court has not held Ms. Singleton to a “strict accountability of compliance with the rules of procedure” due to her *pro se* status. *Holifield v. Reno*, 115 F.3d 1555, 1561 (11th Cir. 1997) (citing *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980)). However, all litigants, *pro se* or not, must comply with court orders, and Ms. Singleton has failed to prosecute this matter and to abide by the orders of the court.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that this action is DISMISSED without prejudice. A final judgment will be entered separately.

DONE this 8th day of February, 2018.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE